

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

PIN: 7084
APPLICANT NAME: Santa Monica Bay Restoration Authority
PROJECT TITLE: North Santa Monica Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Project Proposal
FUNDS REQUESTED: \$27,423,246
COST MATCH: \$27,332,420
TOTAL PROJECT COST: \$54,755,666

DESCRIPTION: The Santa Monica Bay Restoration Authority is currently engaged in completing a Draft IRWM Plan. A Final IRWM Plan is scheduled to be adopted in December 2006. The Draft Plan outlines a set of regional objectives and identifies an array of regional water management strategies and specific projects aimed at meeting those objectives. Regional short- and long-term implementation priorities were developed, and projects were prioritized accordingly. The NSMB regional objectives were developed as part of the Draft IRWM Plan. Consistent with the Draft Plan, sixteen near-term projects are proposed in this application. These projects were selected for inclusion based on their ability to achieve regional objectives, integrated nature, ability to achieve multiple benefits, address a mix of water management strategies, include a large number of agencies, and readiness-to-proceed.

Question: Consistency with Minimum IRWM Standards - This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated that the IRWM Plan meets the minimum standards.

Pass

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Adopted IRWM Plan and Proof of Formal Adoption. Weighting factor is 1. 2

The IRWMP is not adopted, but there is a schedule for completing and adopting it by Dec 16, 2006.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Description of Region. Weighting factor is 1. 3

The application provides numerous maps illustrating the region, watersheds, land use, cities involved, service areas, as well as impaired waters and ASBS. Maps are accompanied by a description of the region. Water quality issues are adequately discussed but the application lacks information on the quantity of water resources within the region and the demand and supply projections for the 20year planning period. Also, information on cultural and economic conditions and trends are yet to be compiled and placed in the IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Objectives. Weighting factor is 1. 5

The applicant presents draft regional objectives, how they were derived, and a discussion of their relationship to larger water management issues in the region. The IRWMP does address the major water related objectives in the region. The applicant states that the objectives will be further refined in the final IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Water Management Strategies and Integration. Weighting factor is 1. 4

The criterion is fully addressed but not fully supported. The applicant discusses all major water management strategies that were considered for the IRWMP. Reasonable explanations were given for strategies that were not applicable. The applicant discusses the current planning documents that speak to certain strategies. In addition the applicant presents a table showing which strategies are addressed by proposed projects. There are weaknesses in the discussion of how to integrate each agency's strategies. While the applicant does acknowledge advantages of integrating strategies, the process of project/strategy integration is not complete and will be in the Final IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Priorities and Schedule. Weighting factor is 1. 3

A regional priority list of projects is provided. Projects were ranked using a comprehensive scoring system with input from many stakeholders. Short- and long-term implementation priorities are identified and a discussion on the prioritization process is included. There is not much discussion on how the prioritization process actually is implemented or how the IRWMP will respond to regional changes so the criteria is not fully addressed.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Implementation. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The IRWMP identifies on-going studies and projects for implementation (current and future). The applicant identifies the responsible entity for proposed projects. Linkages and dependencies are not fully addressed. It appears that the applicant interprets linkages as project commonalities. The applicant states that all proposed projects are technically and programmatically feasible, but does not provide supporting information. A governance structure for managing the IRWMP is not currently in place but it is being developed for the final IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Impacts and Regional Benefits. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The analysis of impacts and benefits is mostly missing in the IRWMP but completion of the analysis is part of the work plan for finishing the IRWMP. Although the applicant discusses benefits of the plan, there is no discussion of potential negative impacts to the region from certain projects. There is no discussion of benefits to be derived from local planning versus regional efforts and no evaluation of impacts or benefits to other resources or DACs.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Technical Analysis and Plan Performance. Weighting factor is 1.

3

The criterion is not fully addressed or thoroughly documented. The metrics for plan performance are not provided, but are part of the work plan for the final IRWMP. Individual projects will contain metrics, but not much more is stated in the IRWMP. Project level analysis and performance metrics are described generically. There is no mention of any possible data gaps nor the actual methods or analyses used to determine management strategies.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Data Management. Weighting factor is 1.

2

Data management is only marginally addressed in the IRWMP. The applicant does claim that data management is discussed in separate reports and plans, but these reports are not cited or included in the IRWMP. Existing monitoring efforts and data dissemination efforts either do not exist or are not discussed, but will be addressed in the monitoring plan that would be developed the Final IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Financing. Weighting factor is 1.

3

Section L in Attachment 3 did not identify any beneficiaries of the IRWMP. The applicant and stakeholders have agreed to provide funding and staff for ongoing adoption and implementation of the IRWMP. The applicant states that the O&M costs are the responsibility of each project's lead agency and the agency's commitment to cover those costs is part of the prioritization procedures. Financing of projects is also the responsibility of the lead agency although the applicant is the grant recipient for any regional grant monies. A high level of matching funds is indicated, but the matching funds are not yet secured and the final source of match funds for each project is not determined.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Relation to Local Planning & Sustainability. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The IRWMP acknowledges that local plans will need to be considered in the development of the Final IRWMP and identifies some of the adopted local planning documents in the region. There is inadequate discussion about actions or projects included in the IRWMP and how they are related to local planning documents. Coordination with local land use planning decision makers is not discussed in the IRWMP. The IRWMP relationship to local planning will be developed as part of the work plan for the final IRWMP.

Question: Consistency with IRWM Standards - Stakeholder Involvement & Coordination. Weighting factor is 1.

2

The application discusses the region's history of stakeholder involvement and identifies past and present stakeholders. The process used for inclusion of stakeholders through workshops is outlined, but how they were identified is not discussed. Only the public outreach activities specific to the regional water management group are documented. Discussions about developing new partnerships, environmental justice concerns, and involvement of DACs in the planning process were not provided. Coordination with State and federal agencies is mentioned, but it is not well documented and areas where these agencies may be able to assist are not identified. Possible obstacles to plan implementation are not identified or discussed.

Question: Funding Match. This evaluation will focus on whether the applicant has demonstrated the ability to meet the minimum funding match or has requested a waiver or reduction in the funding match.

Pass

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Integrated Regional Water Management Implementation Proposition 50, Chapter 8 IRWM Implementation Step 1

Question: Description of Proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

12

The applicant provides descriptions of each of the 16 projects. The descriptions include some details about project integration with other projects, water management strategies addressed, scientific basis for projects, and monitoring methods for measuring project effectiveness. Descriptions of project benefits are a little generic. There is no discussion of achieving compliance with environmental requirements. There is no specific discussion of how the proposal is consistent with the IRWMP. The criteria are not fully supported by documentation. Presently six strategies are checked leaving it unclear which is the main strategy. A primary water management strategy should be identified with supporting strategies listed as such.

Question: Project Prioritization. Weighting factor is 2.

10

A prioritized list of projects within the proposal and the region is provided. The list includes high priority projects identified in the IRWMP and the prioritization process is sufficiently detailed. Tier 1 projects (i.e. the 16 projects included in the proposal) were determined based on regional and State priorities, as well as readiness, integration, and potential impacts.

Question: Cost Estimate. Weighting factor is 1.

4

The applicant provides tables summarizing the total funds requested for the proposal and each project including matching funds available. Costs appear to be reasonable for projects. Some costs are not well documented or are confusing (e.g., non-state match funds for Project 9 are described as either \$20,350,000 or \$12,500,000; see pg 713). The cost effectiveness of each project is unclear. Project 16 requests \$3.25 million to improve Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems (OWTS). \$2.5 million in grant funds would go to 83 individual property owners to upgrade their private OWTS. It is questionable if this is cost effective or an eligible use of grant funds.

Question: Schedule. Weighting factor is 1.

5

Applicant presents a schedule showing sequence and timing of proposal implementation.

Question: Need. Weighting factor is 2.

8

Applicant discusses the need for the proposal as a whole and then the need on an individual project basis. There is some discussion of impacts should each individual project not be implemented. Additional information on critical impacts should the projects not be implemented would have resulted in a higher score.

Question: Disadvantaged Communities. Weighting factor is 2.

4

The applicant indicates there are no DAC in this region but claims that the use of regional recreational opportunities would provide benefits to DAC residents that live outside of the region.

Question: Program Preferences. Weighting factor is 1.

4

All program preferences are addressed except the last one. There are no drinking water or water quality projects that serve DACs and all of the projects are located within the service area of MWD. At least half of the proposed projects address water quantity and water supply reliability. The majority of the projects will contribute to meeting long-term water quality standards in the region. The targeting of NPS pollution will reduce eutrophication in Malibu lagoon as well as reducing the number of beach closures that occur each year.

TOTAL SCORE: 81
